

4/14/2013

To whom it may concern:

I am writing on the behalf of the Alliance for Wise Energy Decisions. We are an informal, non-profit, non-partisan coalition of North American organizations, businesses, communities, and individuals who are concerned about the future of the electrical energy sector. Our position is that we do have serious environmental and energy issues and that these issues should be resolved using real science. For this reason, we stand in opposition to the extension of the Production Tax Credit (PTC). The PTC has been in effect for over twenty years now, despite the fact that there has never been a comprehensive, transparent, independent, and empirical evaluation that wind power is either beneficial for the environment or economically viable. In fact, most legitimate scientific assessments reveal that it meets neither of those standards.

It is poor economic policy to subsidize inefficient sources of power. Electricity produced by wind is neither reliable or predictable. On average, turbines produce only about 30% of their capacity and often times they produce 0% of it. Given that there is not a way to economically store generated electricity for later use, there is no way for wind power to consistently meet human demand for electricity. Because of the inefficiency of the source, wind power electricity is preposterously expensive compared to other sources. In the United States, taxpayers pay around \$23.00/kWh in subsidies to simply make wind affordable to ratepayers. To put that number in perspective, the per-kWh cost for other sources are \$1.59 for nuclear, \$0.67 for hydroelectric, \$0.44 for coal, and \$0.25 for natural gas. Lastly, a higher percentage of wind in our electricity portfolio will undoubtedly raise the overall cost of electricity for all ratepayers. In the United States, 3.5% of our electricity currently comes from wind, and ratepayers pay around \$0.10/kWh. Compare that to Denmark, where wind makes up 20% of the energy portfolio (by far the highest percentage in the world) and ratepayers pay around \$0.35/kWh.

There are those who say that the above concerns do not matter, because wind power will benefit the environment. I completely reject the notion that economic concerns are a trivial matter, but I will address the validity of the claimed environmental benefits. Proponents state that wind power will reduce CO₂ emissions, leading to a cleaner environment. However, there is no scientific evidence that wind power can reduce CO₂ in a meaningful way. Even the most optimistic studies provide that a wind-based policy can only reduce around 2% of CO₂ emissions, while many studies show that CO₂ emissions will actually increase when factoring in the manufacturing of turbine parts and the creation of backup, conventional source generators that will become necessary due to wind's inefficiencies. Returning to the example of Denmark, for instance, their nation has the highest amount of CO₂ emissions per kilowatt of any developed nation in the world. This fact can be primarily attributed to their 20% wind portfolio. There are other environmental factors to be considered as well. Upwards of 2 tons of rare earth magnets and metals are needed for the creation of each wind turbine. Land must be cleared and mined to extract these materials and they do not renew themselves at all. Turbines also kill a disturbing number of bats and birds wherever wind farms are located. Not only should we avoid the needless large-scale killing of wildlife, but this also has a profoundly negative impact on local agriculture, which needs these animals to keep the populations of crop-eating insects in check. Lastly, the noise from turbines can have very adverse health effects, such as inner ear problems, sleep deprivation, and even heart disorders.

Since environmental and economic claims in favor of the PTC have been so thoroughly debunked, many supporters now claim that the policy is necessary to create jobs. This view is also patently unfounded and downright false. Most independent studies show that the jobs claims made by the wind lobby are either lavish exaggerations or outright distortions of the facts. For example, some reports from the wind lobby claim that the PTC will create 37,000 jobs. However, this figure is not the number of net jobs, but rather simply the jobs created without consideration to the jobs lost. Multiple studies show that a single wind project can cost a single community upwards of 30,000 net jobs when losses in the tourism, manufacturing, and agricultural sectors are factored into the equation. These figures also do not account for what the taxpayer will be paying to create each job. The one year extension of the PTC from this past December was projected to cost an estimated \$12 billion to taxpayers over the same period of time these 37,000 new jobs were supposed to be created. That adds up to \$330,000 per job. One study of a single wind farm in Oregon estimated that their project would end up costing local taxpayers a \$34 million per job created. These are truly astounding numbers. Inexpensive energy has been proven time and time again to create large amounts of net jobs, so the strategy of subsidizing more expensive forms of energy makes absolutely no economic sense if job creation is the goal.

By now it should be clear that the PTC is a failed policy. We have given it over twenty years and have absolutely no progress to show for it. All that it has done is lead us down the path of an energy policy based on low benefits at high costs. At the end of the day, the PTC asks our citizens to subsidize an industry so that they can pay more for an inferior product. I reject that notion from an economic, environmental, and moral perspective, and ask that you do the same.

Sincerely,

Stefan Medvetz